

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Editorial

McDavid, Carol

2016-02

McDavid , C & Thomas , S 2016 , ' Editorial ' , Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage , vol. 3 , no. 1 , pp. 1-4 . <https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1136182>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/301764>

<https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1136182>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Constraints on community engagement through archaeology and heritage are inevitable. There may be physical constraints on access to a site, legal constraints affecting which forms of engagement are 'acceptable' and which are 'not', financial constraints on what is possible, or political constraints on what can be said (and what must be left unsaid). In many ways, the complications surrounding community archaeology and heritage are just as interesting – and just as significant – as the heritage itself.

In this issue we see case studies from diverse parts of the world, all of which address constraints differently: Arctic Canada, the United Kingdom, Israel and the Netherlands. As diverse as the countries are the types of cultural heritage that the papers discuss, ranging from hunter–gatherer sites, a protected shipwreck and a complex multi-period settlement and fortification site, through to conflict archaeology of the Second World War.

The University of Western Ontario's Colleen Haukaas and Lisa Hodgetts discuss the photogrammetry methods they used to create three-dimensional (3D) images of remote sites in Arctic Canada – creating digital accessibility, especially through social media usage among local indigenous communities – to sites which otherwise are much more difficult to access. Through their use of low-cost programs, they overcome both financial and geographical constraints at their sites of research as part of the Ikaahuk Archaeology Project.

Victoria Cooper and Peta Knott discuss their project – delivered by Wessex Archaeology, funded by Historic England, and with a goal of providing interpretation through a process of collaboration with diving groups for a diving trail of the historic Iona II shipwreck, situated in England's Bristol Channel. While physically inaccessible to non-divers (a physical constraint), the project team had the challenge of fulfilling their funders' requirements while also providing a resource that members of the diving community and others would make use of.

Itzhaq Shai and Joe Uziel present the community archaeology work at the Tel Burna site in Israel – an ongoing project that engages local residents (including Jeremy Szanton – author of the Reflections article in this issue), as well as students, volunteers and researchers from overseas. The authors acknowledge that some communities in Israel and the wider region do not yet engage with the project (particular political constraints with regard to Israel and the international academic community are discussed below).

In the fourth paper of this issue, Jobbe Wijnen, Ivar Schute and Ruurd Kok discuss not only a particular case study site (the battle site of Grebbeberg Mount), but also contextualize this against the backdrop of the continued development of 'conflict archaeology' – particularly of conflicts from the twentieth century – in the Netherlands. They note that, constrained by professional archaeological priorities and interests that lay elsewhere, the sub-discipline grew and developed largely due to public and community-led enthusiasm for history and archaeology of the Second World War. Gradually, this is translating into academic interest, while the public appetite for the material remains of this relatively recent history appears not to waiver.

As mentioned above, the Reflections article of this volume comes from Jeremy Szanton, a volunteer at the Tel Burna project mentioned above. He describes how his personal skills and interest in pottery, combined with a desire to connect in a very personal way with the artisans that had gone before him, allowed an opportunity to contribute both on fieldwork and through laboratory work with the ancient pottery found on-site. His enthusiasm was evidently contagious, as his son went on to train as an archaeologist.

In the final sections of this issue, we offer reviews of two very different books. Emmi Koivisto reviews Mia Ridge's edited volume *Crowdsourcing Our Cultural Heritage*, noting the opportunities for further utilization of crowdsourcing approaches in the heritage sector, as traditional funding sources continue to dwindle, and as the ways in which people can volunteer has begun to include digital engagements. Adrián Carretón reviews *Arqueología Pública en España*, edited by Jaime Almansa Sánchez – covering many issues around public archaeology's development in Spain. These range from the political constraints presented by uninterested decision-makers through the opportunities that digital engagement presents (for example, blogging).

Difficult choices

We must mention a particular challenge that arose while we were considering one of the papers in this volume ('All for Archaeology and Archaeology for All: The Tel Burna Archaeology Project's Approach to Community Archaeology', by Itzhaq Shai and Joe Uziel). One of the authors is affiliated with Ariel University, which is an Israeli University located within the occupied Palestinian territories (West Bank). The site discussed in the paper is not in disputed territory, but is in Israel itself. In a straightforward case study, the authors describe their ongoing efforts to engage with the local Israeli communities which live around Tel Burna.

During the peer review process (after the paper was in our pipeline) one of the reviewers called our attention to the 'Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions' (BDS) movementⁱ, a global campaign started in 2005 which calls for boycotts and other actions against Israel because of their policies with respect to the 'Occupied Territories'. We also learned that the American Anthropological Association (AAA) had recently organized a Task Forceⁱⁱ to explore the potential ramifications of supporting the BDS initiative, as well as the constraints that many scholars who work in Israel faceⁱⁱⁱ. The AAA is considering a formal resolution to support the boycott^{iv}. The AAA membership will vote on this resolution in April of 2016 – after we go to press on this issue. Although the AAA is by no means the only organization concerned with this, it is one of the larger ones debating this issue. After lengthy discussions with our Editorial Board and others, including the article's reviewers and colleagues who work in the region, we discovered that even though the BDS academic boycott guidelines (support for which is growing but not universal) advocate boycotting Israeli academic institutions, they do not call for boycotting individual scholars. In particular, in specific consideration of academic freedom, they note that: 'Mere affiliation of Israeli scholars to an Israeli academic institution is ... not grounds for applying the boycott.'^v Therefore, after considering this (and reviewing the AAA Task Force Report) we decided that publishing this paper would not be in conflict with the principles of BDS as defined by the movement itself.

In keeping with our editorial guidelines, following the peer review process we further encouraged the authors to be as reflexive as they felt they could be about the constraints and challenges they experienced while doing their work, and they did make some key changes to their manuscript. To be clear, our publisher imposed no restrictions at all, and welcomed our group deliberations about the paper and the larger issues that came to light during review. We will discuss some larger concerns about constraints and reflexive writing below.

We will not establish a formal policy with respect to the BDS sanctions now (and wish to avoid nationality-specific review criteria in any case). However, we will continue to monitor the international scholarly discussion and advise future contributors who could be affected that this issue is pending, as soon as they submit. In the meantime, we will address each contribution on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with our editorial board and others.

We will also continue to use this forum to be as open about our editorial decisions as possible, and welcome contributions (including opinion and response pieces) which might further discussion on this and related issues. The challenges they present, for all journals, and for community archaeology, are by no means resolved.

Reflexivity, editorial constraints and the future

As a member of our editorial team noted about the issue described above, 'Now it's gotten real'. Indeed, every paper in this journal is a collaboration between authors, editors and publisher, and thus represents 'real' community archaeology and heritage. We also know that many of those concerned (professionals, community members, readers, editors) use the words printed here as tools – to support or debate policy initiatives, promote political objectives, acknowledge community value, boost professional credibility and more. Likewise, every time any particular voice or heritage is celebrated, valorized, or validated in these pages, another is possibly being ignored, marginalized or erased. Simply listing examples of the 'fraught', contested, upsetting, difficult or even bloody contexts where this occurs could not be inclusive, and would thus risk glossing the pain that some humans suffer at the hands of others who define justice, human rights and heritage differently. Many of those who 'do' community archaeology or heritage work could choose their own battles as 'mattering more' than others, and in this practice of community archaeology, editorial choices matter too.

Our approach thus far has been to consider all contributions with no pre-determined limits or boundaries, other than those described in our style guides. As we continue to do this, we accept that the process will often be messy – and that criticism is likely whatever choices we make. We take it as given that all of the authors who publish here must make difficult decisions about how open, self-critical and reflexive they can be. We also know that many are not used to writing in this way – archaeologists, in particular, often feel constrained by disciplinary expectations of what sort of writing 'counts'. As editors, we consistently push the issue farther than many expect, and our editorial guidelines set standards and offer ideas on how to meet them. The final judgement about whether any paper meets those standards will be yours, as readers.

Although much community archaeology writing leans towards celebratory descriptive reporting instead of detailed research and analysis, we reject the idea that these categories are mutually exclusive. We believe that community collaborators are usually keen observers and insightful analysts, and that one can celebrate even as one reflects honestly and candidly. No project is perfect – there are always challenges – and most participants are aware of them. Given that the pressure to publish is probably why most of our submissions have been (thus far) from professionals (usually working in universities or heritage organizations), we look first to professional writers to find new ways to write and new ways to include community voices in that writing. We also look to those outside the profession to prod and support their professional partners – hoping that, over time, they will contribute their own pieces. Anyone who submits to us, whether in the archaeology/heritage profession or outside it, will find a supportive team and a willingness to work with anyone.

Among our team and Editorial Board, we have also discussed the pros and cons of producing a special issue or forum on the challenges of writing reflexively and critically about difficult issues. Something like this may emerge in the future (again, comments and feedback are welcome), but for now we feel that such issues, and the ethics surrounding them, should not be 'bracketed off' as a distinct topic, and that difficult situations should not be seen as exceptions. Rather, these challenges and dilemmas are a necessary part of community engagement with archaeology and heritage. We are also considering a format in which we invite responses to some papers and publish them together – this will likely happen soon. Part of our job is to push people to reflect on what they have learned (the process of engagement is a good teacher) and to

write about it. Although we are not always as successful as we would wish, we will continue to try, with our authors and readers as collaborators and partners.

ⁱ See <http://www.bdsmovement.net> for more information

ⁱⁱ For the full AAATask Force report, see <http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/151001-AAA-Task-Force-Israel-Palestine.pdf>.

ⁱⁱⁱ For an in-depth article about this, see <https://anthroboycott.wordpress.com>

^{iv} See <http://blog.americananthro.org/2016/01/14/message-from-the-aaa-president-member-engagement-alert/>

^v See <http://www.pacbi.org/etemplate.php?id=1108>